

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04091 312342Z

15
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-13 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-15 ACDA-19

NEA-10 TRSE-00 MBFR-03 SAJ-01 AEC-11 OMB-01 OIC-04

RSR-01 ADP-00 /157 W
----- 113438

R 311925Z AUG 73
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1383
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY BONN
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
USMISSION GENEVA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 4091

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PFOR, NATO
SUBJECT: CSCE - CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

REF: STATE 162304 (NOTAL)

1. SUMMARY: FOLLOWING INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS WITH FRG AND UK DELS, U.S. REP ADVISED SENIOR POLADS AUGUST 31 PER REFTEL THAT A DISTINCTION SHOULD BE MADE BETWEEN MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS FOR CBM'S IN CSCE CONTEXT. U.S. REP PROPOSED THAT POLADS TAKE UP SUBJECT, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO IMPLICATIONS FOR MBFR OF INCLUSION OF MOVEMENTS IN CBMS. POINT OF DEPARTURE COULD BE PAPER ON ILLUSTRATIVE LISTS (POLADS(73)14 - SEE USNATO 2108). ALTHOUGH SPC AGREED TO POLADS STUDY, WHICH WILL BEGIN SEPTEMBER 11, INITIAL UNSTRUCTURED REACTION OF SEVERAL DELS TO U.S. PRESENTATION WAS NEGATIVE. END SUMMARY.

2. U.S. REP ADVISED SPC THAT WE BELIEVED, AS NORWEGIAN REP HAD STATED AT RECENT SPC MEETING, THAT FURTHER STUDY OF RELATION-CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04091 312342Z

SHIP BETWEEN CBM'S IN CSCE CONTEXT AND MBFR CONSTRAINTS WAS NEEDED. HE NOTED THAT THIS WAS SUBJECT OF CONSIDERABLE INTEREST IN WASHINGTON AND THAT WE BELIEVED NATO SHOULD CONSIDER PROBLEM THAT MIGHT BE CAUSED BY OVERLAP BETWEEN CBM'S AND MBFR CONSTRAINTS.

ONE WAY TO ATTACK PROBLEM WOULD BE TO DISTINGUISH CLEARLY BETWEEN MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS, POSSIBLY RESERVING LATTER TO MBFR. U.S. REP POINTED OUT DANGER THAT SOVIETS MIGHT AGREE TO RELATIVELY PERMISSIVE CBM ON MOVEMENTS IN CSCE CONTEXT AND THEN USE THIS AS BASIS FOR RESISTING MORE STRINGENT MEASURE IN MBFR. HE CONCLUDED WITH SUGGESTION THAT POLADS TAKE UP SUBJECT, DEPARTING FROM EXISTING PAPER ON ILLUSTRATIVE LISTS. REGARDING AS YET UNAGREED PARA SEVEN OF THAT PAPER, U.S. REP SAID WE WOULD PREFER TO LEAVE THIS POINT OPEN UNTIL MORE GENERAL SUBJECT OF MOVEMENTS WAS CLARIFIED.

3. THERE WERE NO OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSAL THAT POLADS STUDY THIS SUBJECT FURTHER. UK REP, HOWEVER, OBSERVED THAT ALLIES HAD SUCCEEDED IN OBTAINING INCLUSION OF MOVEMENTS IN FINAL MPT DOCUMENT ONLY BY DINT OF GREAT EFFORTS AND SUGGESTED IT WAS UNWISE TO GIVE UP POINT NOW. HE ALSO REFERRED TO UK "EXPLANATORY PAPER" ON CBM'S CIRCULATED IN HELSINKI WHICH STATES, INTER ALIA, THAT MOVEMENTS OF EVEN GREATER IMPORTANCE THAN MANEUVERS (SEE PARA FOUR OF UK PAPER). TURKISH REP SUGGESTED THAT SUBJECT SHOULD ALSO BE VIEWED IN TERMS OF ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR MBFR PARTICIPATION ISSUE SINCE NEUTRALS WOULD DOUBTLESS BE QUITE CONCERNED OVER WATERING DOWN OF MILITARY SECURITY ELEMENT OF CSCE IN VIEW OF THEIR EXCLUSION FROM MBFR. NORWEGIAN REP MADE SAME POINT AND ADVISED THAT OSLO WAS CURRENTLY WORKING ON "EXPLANATORY PAPER" ON CBM'S WHICH ARGUED FOR INCLUSION OF MOVEMENTS. WHILE NOTING THAT FRANCE WAS NOT ONE OF NEUTRALS REFERRED TO BY TURKISH AND NORWEGIAN REPS, FRENCH REP SAID HE BELIEVED THAT U.S. SUGGESTION COULD CAUSE PROBLEMS FOR PARIS BECAUSE OF FRENCH NON-PARTICIPATION IN MBFR. FRG REP DID NOT ENTER DISCUSSION. HOWEVER, FRG REP INFORMED US PRIOR TO MEETING THAT HE WAS INFORMED BY TELEPHONE CALL FROM BONN AUGUST 30 THAT HE WOULD SOON RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONS TO INTRODUCE FRG'S CBM DECLARATION (TEXT USNATO 3505) IN SPC AND TO NOTE THAT FRG WOULD ALSO BE ASKING EC-9 TO STUDY IT.

4. COMMENT: FOR SEPTEMBER 11 POLADS MEETING, WE WOULD APPRECIATE RECEIVING REVISED U.S. ILLUSTRATIVE LIST (SEE USNATO 3899),
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04091 312342Z

PARTICULARLY SINCE THIS COULD BE HELPFUL IN DEMONSTRATING TO ALLIES THAT WE SEEK MEANINGFUL CBM ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS. FOR SOME MEETING, WE WOULD WELCOME AND ADDITIONAL RATIONALE AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT EXCLUSION OF MOVEMENTS FROM CSCE.
MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 31 AUG 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO04091
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730868/abqcebvb.tel
Line Count: 103
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 162304 (NOTAL)
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07-Aug-2001 by izenbei0>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE - CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES
TAGS: PFOR, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
GENEVA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

